arXiv:1704.06179v2 [math.PR] 21 Apr 2017

Spectral tail processes and max-stable approximations of multivariate regularly varying time series

Anja Janßen*

April 24, 2017

Abstract

A regularly varying time series as introduced in Basrak and Segers (2009) is a (multivariate) time series such that all finite dimensional distributions are multivariate regularly varying. The extremal behavior of such a process can then be described by the index of regular variation and the so-called spectral tail process, which is the limiting distribution of the rescaled process, given an extreme event at time 0. As shown in Basrak and Segers (2009), the stationarity of the underlying time series implies a certain structure of the spectral tail process, informally known as the "time change formula". In this article, we show that on the other hand, every process which satisfies this property is in fact the spectral tail process of an underlying stationary max-stable process. The spectral tail process and the corresponding max-stable process then provide two complementary views on the extremal behavior of a multivariate regularly varying stationary time series.

Keywords and phrases: max-stable processes; regularly varying time series; spectral tail process; stationary processes
AMS 2010 Classification: 60G70 (60G10; 60G55).

1 Introduction

The concept of regular variation has become a standard tool for the extremal analysis of multivariate time series. Roughly speaking, the assumption of regular variation of a time series implies that extremal episodes from this time series can be modelled as the product of a heavy-tailed radial component which determines the magnitude of the extremal event and an independent and normalized random vector which determines the dependence structure between the different components of one observation and over time. There are different ways of defining this second random component, depending on the specification of an "extremal event". In the case of a stationary time series, one often looks at the limiting distribution of the rescaled process conditioned on the event that the observation at time 0 exceeds in norm a threshold which tends to infinity.

In the following, let $\|\cdot\|$ be an arbitrary but fixed norm on $\mathbb{R}^d$. Write $\mathcal{L}(X)$ for the distribution of a random quantity X and $\mathcal{L}(X|A)$ or $\mathcal{L}(X|Y)$ for the distribution of X conditioned on the event A or the σ-algebra which is generated from the random quantity Y. We denote weak convergence by $\overset{w}{\Rightarrow}$.

*University of Copenhagen, Department of Mathematics, Universitetsparken 5, 2100 Copenhagen, Denmark; email: anja@math.ku.dk

Definition 1.1. *Let $(X_t)_{t\in\mathbb{Z}}$ be a stationary time series with values in $\mathbb{R}^d$. If there exists a time series $(\Theta_t)_{t\in\mathbb{Z}}$, such that*

$$\mathcal{L}\left(\left(\frac{X_s}{\|X_0\|},\dots,\frac{X_t}{\|X_0\|}\right)\middle|\,\|X_0\|>x\right)\overset{w}{\Rightarrow}\mathcal{L}(\Theta_s,\dots,\Theta_t),\quad x\to\infty, \tag{1.1}$$

for all $s,t\in\mathbb{Z}$, then we call $(\Theta_t)_{t\in\mathbb{Z}}$ the spectral tail process *of $(X_t)_{t\in\mathbb{Z}}$. The process $(\Theta_t)_{t\in\mathbb{N}_0}$ is called the* forward spectral tail process *and $(\Theta_{-t})_{t\in\mathbb{N}_0}$ is called the* backward spectral tail process*.*

If there exists a time series $(Y_t)_{t\in\mathbb{Z}}$ such that

$$\mathcal{L}\left(\left(\frac{X_s}{x},\dots,\frac{X_t}{x}\right)\middle|\,\|X_0\|>x\right)\overset{w}{\Rightarrow}\mathcal{L}(Y_s,\dots,Y_t),\quad x\to\infty, \tag{1.2}$$

for all $s,t\in\mathbb{Z}$, then we call $(Y_t)_{t\in\mathbb{Z}}$ the tail process *of $(X_t)_{t\in\mathbb{Z}}$.* □

Remark 1.2. *As shown in Basrak and Segers (2009), Theorems 2.1 and 3.1, for a stationary time series $(X_t)_{t\in\mathbb{Z}}$ the two convergences* (1.1) *and* (1.2) *are equivalent and we have*

$$(Y_t)_{t\in\mathbb{Z}}\overset{d}{=}(Y\cdot\Theta_t)_{t\in\mathbb{Z}},$$

for a Pareto(α)-distributed r.v. Y independent of $(\Theta_t)_{t\in\mathbb{Z}}$ (where $\overset{d}{=}$ denotes equality in distribution). The value of α is called the index of regular variation *of $(X_t)_{t\in\mathbb{Z}}$. Furthermore, any of these two convergences is equivalent to that the time series is regularly varying, i.e. all its finite dimensional distributions are multivariate regularly varying.* □

In the following we will always deal with a stationary underlying process $(X_t)_{t\in\mathbb{Z}}$. It is important to note that the spectral tail process $(\Theta_t)_{t\in\mathbb{Z}}$ of an underlying stationary process is in general not a stationary time series, since we condition on a particular event that happens at time 0. However, one can show that the resulting spectral tail process of a stationary underlying time series satisfies a different property instead. In the following we write 0 for the real number or a vector or sequence consisting of all zeros. The meaning should be clear from the context.

Property (TCF). *We say that a time series $(\Theta_t)_{t\in\mathbb{Z}}$ with values in $\mathbb{R}^d$ satisfies* Property (TCF) *if $P(\|\Theta_0\|=1)=1$ and the so-called "time-change formula" (Segers et al. (2017)) holds, i.e. if for $\alpha>0$*

$$E(f(\Theta_{s-i},\dots,\Theta_{t-i}))=E\left(f\left(\frac{\Theta_s}{\|\Theta_i\|},\dots,\frac{\Theta_t}{\|\Theta_i\|}\right)\mathbb{1}_{\{\|\Theta_i\|>0\}}\|\Theta_i\|^\alpha\right) \tag{1.3}$$

for all $s\le 0\le t, i\in\mathbb{Z}$, and all bounded and continuous functions $f:(\mathbb{R}^d)^{t-s+1}\to\mathbb{R}$ such that $f(\theta_s,\dots,\theta_t)=0$ whenever $\theta_0=0$. □

Note that the above property depends on the parameter $\alpha>0$, so it would be more precise to speak of Property (TCF(α)) instead, but for reasons of brevity we omit the parameter which we assume to be fixed throughout.

Remark 1.4. *(i) We have added the indicator function in* (1.3) *in order to make clear that the expression in the expected value is to be interpreted as* 0 *on the set where $\|\Theta_i\|=0$ (and thus the argument of the function f is not defined). In the following we will in most cases omit the indicator function for the sake of brevity.*

(ii) Similar as in Janßen and Segers (2014) one can show that Property (TCF) implies that (1.3) *even holds for all bounded and* measurable *functions f such that $f(\theta_s, \dots, \theta_t) = 0$ whenever $\theta_0 = 0$.*

(iii) Here and in the following, we assume that all stochastic processes are defined on a probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{A}, P)$ where $\mathcal{A}$ is the smallest σ-algebra such that all finite-dimensional observations from the process are Borel measurable. Thereby, the law of the stochastic process is completely determined its finite-dimensional distributions and Property (TCF) implies that

$$E(f((\Theta_{t-i})_{t\in\mathbb{Z}})) = E\left(f\left(\left(\frac{\Theta_t}{\|\Theta_i\|}\right)_{t\in\mathbb{Z}}\right)\|\Theta_i\|^\alpha\right), \quad i \in \mathbb{Z}, \tag{1.4}$$

for all bounded functions $f : (\mathbb{R}^d)^{\mathbb{Z}} \to \mathbb{R}$ such that $f((\theta_t)_{t\in\mathbb{Z}}) = 0$ whenever $\theta_0 = 0$ and f is $\mathcal{B}((\mathbb{R}^d)^{\mathbb{Z}})$-$\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})$-measurable, where $\mathcal{B}(\cdot)$ stands for the corresponding Borel-σ-algebra. □

As shown in Basrak and Segers (2009), Theorem 3.1, Property (TCF) (with α being equal to the index of regular variation) is always satisfied for a spectral tail process of an underlying stationary regularly varying process. See also Segers et al. (2017) for the more general case of X_t taking values in a "star-shaped" metric space.

We will subsequently deal with the question if in turn Property (TCF) implies that the corresponding process is a spectral tail process of some underlying process. We show that the answer is yes and we will construct corresponding underlying max-stable processes, see Theorem 4.2. It will turn out that the case were additionally a summability or short-range dependence condition (see Section 2 for details) is satisfied allows for a particularly simple construction which is based on multivariate mixed moving maxima processes, see Theorem 3.2 and Corollary 3.3. This construction allows us to connect the extremal behavior of the process conditioned on the specific event of an extremal exceedance at time 0 with the overall extremal behavior over time as modelled by a max-stable process, see Proposition 3.5. The spectral tail process and the approximation of extremal events by a max-stable process thus provide two complementary views on the extremal behavior of a regularly varying time series. Additionally, this point of view also gives rise to a theoretical motivation (Proposition 3.6) for the POT method for dependent observations which uses clusterwise maxima for estimation of extremal parameters, see Davison and Smith (1990).

There are some links between our work and Engelke et al. (2014), who explore connections between different representations of univariate max-stable processes. However, our approach differs substantially by starting solely from Property (TCF) and focussing on the particular properties implied by stationarity of processes. There are also some connections between the topics studied here and theoretical properties of stationary max- and sum-stable processes which were analyzed in (among others) Rosinski (1995), Roy and Samorodnitsky (2008), Wang and Stoev (2010) and Dombry and Kabluchko (2016). But there the analysis starts from a stable process and is focussed on suitable decompositions of this process, while our approach is somehow the other way round by starting with the spectral process and finding a suitable composition of copies from this process in order to generate a max-stable process with given properties. Furthermore, the aforementioned works rely heavily on tools from dynamical systems theory, while our approach is solely based on the description of finite-dimensional distributions of stochastic processes and point process techniques, which are two standard tools of extreme value theory for time series.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows: Section 2 introduces and analyzes a short-range dependence condition which, if satisfied in addition to Property (TCF), allows us to construct an

underlying mixed moving maxima process with given spectral tail process, as shown in Section 3. At the end of this section, we also discuss implications of our results for statistical analysis. Section 4 finally treats the general case where we show that again an underlying stationary process exists but has a more complicated representation than in the short-range dependence setting.

2 A shift invariance property derived from Property (TCF)

We start by showing that Property (TCF), together with a summability assumption, implies a certain shift invariance of the process $(\Theta_t)_{t\in\mathbb{Z}}$.

Property (SC). *We say that a time series $(\Theta_t)_{t\in\mathbb{Z}}$ with values in $\mathbb{R}^d$ satisfies the summability condition (SC) for $\alpha > 0$ if*

$$0 < \sum_{t\in\mathbb{Z}} \|\Theta_t\|^\alpha < \infty \quad a.s.$$

The same comment as for Property (TCF) about the omission of the parameter α also applies here. In case that Property (SC) is satisfied, we introduce the following notation

$$\|\Theta\|_\alpha = \|(\Theta_t)_{t\in\mathbb{Z}}\|_\alpha := \left(\sum_{t\in\mathbb{Z}} \|\Theta_t\|^\alpha\right)^{1/\alpha}.$$

For $\alpha \geq 1$, this is just the L_α-norm of $(\|\Theta_t\|)_{t\in\mathbb{Z}}$, but remember that $\alpha < 1$ is also possible.

At first, the summability condition (SC) may look rather restrictive, but as the following lemma shows it is in fact equivalent to a condition which is for example always satisfied if $\|\Theta_t\| \to 0$ a.s. for $|t| \to \infty$ which seems very reasonable for many applications.

In order to make this equivalent property precise, we first have to introduce some additional notation and define the following random variables. We set

$$\|\Theta^*\| = \|\Theta^*\|((\Theta_t)_{t\in\mathbb{Z}}) := \sup_{t\in\mathbb{Z}} \|\Theta_t\| \in [0,\infty] \tag{2.1}$$

and

$$T^* = T^*((\Theta_t)_{t\in\mathbb{Z}}) := \inf\{t \in \mathbb{Z} : \|\Theta_t\| = \|\Theta^*\|\} \in \overline{\mathbb{Z}} := \mathbb{Z} \cup \{-\infty\} \cup \{\infty\}. \tag{2.2}$$

As usual, we set $\inf(\mathbb{Z}) = -\infty$ and $\inf(\emptyset) = \infty$. So, in particular, $\|\Theta^*\| = \infty$ implies $T^* = \infty$.

Lemma 2.2. *Let Property (TCF) hold. Then the following two statements are equivalent:*

(i) $\sum_{t\in\mathbb{Z}} \|\Theta_t\|^\alpha < \infty$ *a.s. (i.e. Property (SC) holds)*

(ii) $P(T^* \in \mathbb{Z}) = 1$ □

Proof. If (i) holds, then necessarily $\|\Theta_t\| \to 0$ a.s. as $|t| \to \infty$. Since furthermore $\|\Theta_0\| = 1$ a.s., this implies that both $\|\Theta^*\|$ and T^* are finite a.s. and (ii) holds.

Let (ii) hold and assume that $P(\sum_{k\in\mathbb{Z}} \|\Theta_k\|^\alpha = \infty) > 0$. Then there exists an $i^* \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $P(\sum_{k\in\mathbb{Z}} \|\Theta_k\|^\alpha = \infty, T^* = i^*) > 0$ and therefore

$$\infty \quad = \quad E\left(\mathbb{1}_{\{T^*=i^*\}} \sum_{k\in\mathbb{Z}} \|\Theta_k\|^\alpha\right)$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&= \sum_{k\in\mathbb{Z}} E\left(\mathbb{1}_{\{T^*=i^*\}}\|\Theta_k\|^\alpha\right)\\
&= \sum_{k\in\mathbb{Z}} E\left(\mathbb{1}_{\{\|\Theta_j\|<\|\Theta_{i^*}\|, j<i^*, \|\Theta_j\|\le\|\Theta_{i^*}\|, j\ge i^*\}}\mathbb{1}_{\{\Theta_0\neq 0\}}\|\Theta_k\|^\alpha\right)\\
&= \sum_{k\in\mathbb{Z}} E\left(f\left(\left(\frac{\Theta_t}{\|\Theta_k\|}\right)_{t\in\mathbb{Z}}\right)\|\Theta_k\|^\alpha\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

with

$$
f((\theta_t)_{t\in\mathbb{Z}}) = \mathbb{1}_{\{\|\theta_j\|<\|\theta_{i^*}\|, j<i^*, \|\theta_j\|\le\|\theta_{i^*}\|, j\ge i^*\}}\mathbb{1}_{\{\theta_0\neq 0\}},
$$

which is bounded, measurable and $f((\theta_t)_{t\in\mathbb{Z}}) = 0$ whenever $\theta_0 = 0$. Therefore, with (1.4) applied to each summand, this expression equals

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{k\in\mathbb{Z}} E\left(f\left(\Theta_{t-k}\right)_{t\in\mathbb{Z}}\right)\\
=\ &\sum_{k\in\mathbb{Z}} E\left(\mathbb{1}_{\{\|\Theta_j\|<\|\Theta_{i^*-k}\|, j<i^*-k, \|\Theta_j\|\le\|\Theta_{i^*-k}\|, j\ge i^*-k\}}\mathbb{1}_{\{\Theta_{-k}\neq 0\}}\right)\\
\le\ &\sum_{k\in\mathbb{Z}} E\left(\mathbb{1}_{\{\|\Theta_j\|<\|\Theta_{i^*-k}\|, j<i^*-k, \|\Theta_j\|\le\|\Theta_{i^*-k}\|, j\ge i^*-k\}}\right)\\
=\ &\sum_{k\in\mathbb{Z}} P(T^* = i^* - k) = 1,
\end{aligned}
$$

which leads to a contradiction to our assumption that $P(\sum_{k\in\mathbb{Z}}\|\Theta_k\|^\alpha = \infty) > 0$ and thereby proves the statement. □

Under the assumption of Property (SC) we will now formulate an equivalent statement for Property (TCF). This equivalence allows for a probabilistic interpretation of the time change formula in form of an invariance property of $(\Theta_t)_{t\in\mathbb{Z}}$ under a specific random shift of time.

Theorem 2.3. *Let $(\Theta_t)_{t\in\mathbb{Z}}$ with values in $\mathbb{R}^d$ be a time series which satisfies Property (SC). Furthermore, let $(\Theta_t^{RS})_{t\in\mathbb{Z}}$ be a time series such that*

$$
(\Theta_t^{RS})_{t\in\mathbb{Z}} \stackrel{d}{=} \left(\frac{\Theta_{t+K(\Theta)}}{\|\Theta_{K(\Theta)}\|}\right)_{t\in\mathbb{Z}}, \tag{2.3}
$$

where $K(\Theta) = K((\Theta_t)_{t\in\mathbb{Z}})$ is a random integer with conditional probability mass function

$$
P(K(\Theta) = k|(\Theta_t)_{t\in\mathbb{Z}}) = \frac{\|\Theta_k\|^\alpha}{\sum_{t\in\mathbb{Z}}\|\Theta_t\|^\alpha} = \frac{\|\Theta_k\|^\alpha}{\|\Theta\|_\alpha^\alpha}, \quad k\in\mathbb{Z}. \tag{2.4}
$$

Then

$$
(\Theta_t^{RS})_{t\in\mathbb{Z}} \stackrel{d}{=} (\Theta_t)_{t\in\mathbb{Z}} \tag{2.5}
$$

if and only if $(\Theta_t)_{t\in\mathbb{Z}}$ satisfies Property (TCF). □

The index *RS* in the time series above may be interpreted as standing both for "random shift" and "re-scaled".

Proof. 1.“ $\Rightarrow$ ”: Assume that all assumptions of Theorem 2.3 are met and that (2.5) holds. Since $\|\Theta_0^{\mathrm{RS}}\| = 1$ a.s. by (2.3), we have $P(\|\Theta_0\| = 1) = 1$, i.e. the first part of Property (TCF) is satisfied. For $s \le 0 \le t$ let $f : (\mathbb{R}^d)^{t-s+1} \to \mathbb{R}$ be a bounded and continuous functions such that $f(y_s, \dots, y_t) = 0$ whenever $y_0 = 0$. Then, for $i \in \mathbb{Z}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
& E(f(\Theta_{s-i}, \dots, \Theta_{t-i})) \\
= \; & E\left(\sum_{k\in\mathbb{Z}} \frac{\|\Theta_k\|^\alpha}{\|\Theta\|_\alpha^\alpha} f(\Theta_{s-i}, \dots, \Theta_{t-i})\right) \\
= \; & E\left(\sum_{k\in\mathbb{Z}} \frac{\|\Theta_k^{\mathrm{RS}}\|^\alpha}{\|\Theta^{\mathrm{RS}}\|_\alpha^\alpha} f(\Theta_{s-i}^{\mathrm{RS}}, \dots, \Theta_{t-i}^{\mathrm{RS}})\right) \\
= \; & E\left(E\left(\sum_{k\in\mathbb{Z}} \frac{\|\Theta_{k+K(\Theta)}/\|\Theta_{K(\Theta)}\|\|^\alpha}{\|\Theta/\|\Theta_{K(\Theta)}\|\|_\alpha^\alpha} f\left(\frac{\Theta_{s-i+K(\Theta)}}{\|\Theta_{K(\Theta)}\|}, \dots, \frac{\Theta_{t-i+K(\Theta)}}{\|\Theta_{K(\Theta)}\|}\right) \middle| (\Theta_t)_{t\in\mathbb{Z}}\right)\right) \\
= \; & E\left(\sum_{k\in\mathbb{Z}}\sum_{l\in\mathbb{Z}} \frac{\|\Theta_l\|^\alpha}{\|\Theta\|_\alpha^\alpha} \frac{\|\Theta_{k+l}\|^\alpha}{\|\Theta\|_\alpha^\alpha} f\left(\frac{\Theta_{s-i+l}}{\|\Theta_l\|}, \dots, \frac{\Theta_{t-i+l}}{\|\Theta_l\|}\right)\right),
\end{aligned}$$

were we used (2.3), (2.4) and the assumption (2.5). The last expression simplifies to

$$\begin{aligned}
& E\left(\sum_{l\in\mathbb{Z}} \frac{\|\Theta_l\|^\alpha}{\|\Theta\|_\alpha^\alpha} f\left(\frac{\Theta_{s-i+l}}{\|\Theta_l\|}, \dots, \frac{\Theta_{t-i+l}}{\|\Theta_l\|}\right)\right) \\
= \; & E\left(\sum_{m\in\mathbb{Z}} \frac{\|\Theta_{i+m}\|^\alpha}{\|\Theta\|_\alpha^\alpha} f\left(\frac{\Theta_{s+m}}{\|\Theta_{i+m}\|}, \dots, \frac{\Theta_{t+m}}{\|\Theta_{i+m}\|}\right)\right), \quad \text{with } m = l - i, \\
= \; & E\left(\sum_{m\in\mathbb{Z}} \frac{\|\Theta_m\|^\alpha}{\|\Theta\|_\alpha^\alpha} f\left(\frac{\Theta_{s+m}/\|\Theta_m\|}{\|\Theta_{i+m}/\|\Theta_m\|\|}, \dots, \frac{\Theta_{t+m}/\|\Theta_m\|}{\|\Theta_{i+m}/\|\Theta_m\|\|}\right) \frac{\|\Theta_{i+m}\|^\alpha}{\|\Theta_m\|^\alpha}\right) \\
= \; & E\left(f\left(\frac{\Theta_s}{\|\Theta_i\|}, \dots, \frac{\Theta_t}{\|\Theta_i\|}\right) \|\Theta_i\|^\alpha\right),
\end{aligned}$$

where in the last step again (2.5) was used. In the penultimate step we used the assumption about f which guarantees that the corresponding summand in the expected value vanishes as soon as $\|\Theta_m\| = 0$, which allows to expand the fraction by $\|\Theta_m\|^\alpha$ (again, all expressions are assumed to equal 0 as soon as one of the factors is 0, cf. Remark 1.4 (i)). This proves Property (TCF).

2.“ $\Leftarrow$ ”: Assume now that Property (TCF) holds in addition to Property (SC) and let $(\Theta_t^{\mathrm{RS}})_{t\in\mathbb{Z}}$ have a distribution as defined in (2.3) and (2.4). Then it is sufficient to show for all bounded and measurable functions $f : (\mathbb{R}^d)^{\mathbb{Z}} \to \mathbb{R}$ such that $f((\theta_t)_{t\in\mathbb{Z}}) = 0$ whenever $\theta_0 = 0$, that

$$E(f((\Theta_t)_{t\in\mathbb{Z}})) = E(f((\Theta_t^{\mathrm{RS}})_{t\in\mathbb{Z}})).$$

(The above equality has to hold for all bounded and measurable functions in order to have equality in distribution for both processes, but by switching from f to $f'((\theta_t)_{t\in\mathbb{Z}}) = f((\theta_t)_{t\in\mathbb{Z}}) \cdot \mathbb{1}_{\{\theta_0\neq 0\}}$ the above equality is sufficient since $P(\Theta_0 = 0) = P(\Theta_0^{\mathrm{RS}} = 0) = 0$ by Property (TCF) and the construction of $(\Theta_t^{\mathrm{RS}})_{t\in\mathbb{Z}}$.) Set

$$\tilde{f}((\theta_t)_{t\in\mathbb{Z}}) := f\left(\left(\frac{\theta_t}{\|\theta_0\|}\right)_{t\in\mathbb{Z}}\right) \frac{\|\theta_0\|^\alpha}{\|(\theta_t)_{t\in\mathbb{Z}}\|_\alpha^\alpha} \mathbb{1}_{\{\theta_0\neq 0\}},$$

such that, by using the boundedness of f in order to interchange sum and expectation,

$$\begin{aligned}
E(f((\Theta_t^{\mathrm{RS}})_{t\in\mathbb{Z}})) &= E\left(\sum_{k\in\mathbb{Z}} \frac{\|\Theta_{-k}\|^\alpha}{\|\Theta\|_\alpha^\alpha} f\left(\left(\frac{\Theta_{t-k}}{\|\Theta_{-k}\|}\right)_{t\in\mathbb{Z}}\right)\right) \\
&= \sum_{k\in\mathbb{Z}} E\left(\tilde{f}((\Theta_{t-k})_{t\in\mathbb{Z}})\right) \\
&= \sum_{k\in\mathbb{Z}} E\left(\tilde{f}\left(\left(\frac{\Theta_t}{\|\Theta_k\|}\right)_{t\in\mathbb{Z}}\right)\|\Theta_k\|^\alpha\right) \\
&= \sum_{k\in\mathbb{Z}} E\left(f\left(\left(\frac{\Theta_t/\|\Theta_k\|}{\|\Theta_0/\|\Theta_k\|\|}\right)_{t\in\mathbb{Z}}\right)\frac{\|\Theta_0/\|\Theta_k\|\|^\alpha}{\|\Theta/\|\Theta_k\|\|_\alpha^\alpha}\|\Theta_k\|^\alpha\right) \\
&= \sum_{k\in\mathbb{Z}} E\left(f((\Theta_t)_{t\in\mathbb{Z}})\frac{\|\Theta_k\|^\alpha}{\|\Theta\|_\alpha^\alpha}\right) = E\left(f((\Theta_t)_{t\in\mathbb{Z}})\right.
\end{aligned}$$

where we have used (1.4). This concludes the proof. □

3 Construction of a max-stable process with given spectral tail process under Property (SC)

In this section, we will show that for each process $(\Theta_t)_{t\in\mathbb{Z}}$ which satisfies Properties (TCF) and (SC) there exists an underlying max-stable process which has $(\Theta_t)_{t\in\mathbb{Z}}$ as corresponding spectral tail process. The general case were Property (SC) does not need to hold will be treated later in Section 4. For simplicity, we restrict ourselves to the case that all components of Θ_t are non-negative, but see Remark 3.4 for the general case. Since the term "max-stable" has different interpretations in the context of multivariate stochastic processes in the literature, we start with a definition.

Definition 3.1. *We call a stochastic process $(X_t)_{t\in\mathbb{Z}}$ with values in $[0,\infty)^d$* max-stable with index *α, if for all $k\in\mathbb{N}, s\le t, x_s,\dots,x_t\in[0,\infty]^d$*

$$(P(X_s\le x_s,\dots,X_t\le x_t))^k = P(X_s\le k^{-1/\alpha}x_s,\dots,X_t\le k^{-1/\alpha}x_t), \tag{3.1}$$

where all inequalities are to be interpreted componentwise. □

The next theorem has some similarities to Theorem 4.1 in Engelke et al. (2014). Compared to their result we restrict ourselves to the integers as the index set but as an extension we allow both for multivariate observations and also for $\Theta_t = 0$ for some $t\in\mathbb{Z}$.

Theorem 3.2. *Let $(\Theta_t)_{t\in\mathbb{Z}}$ with values in $[0,\infty)^d$ be a stochastic process which satisfies Property (SC). Furthermore, let $(U_i, T_i, (\Theta_t^{(i)})_{t\in\mathbb{Z}})_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$ be an enumeration of points from a Poisson point process on $(0,\infty)\times\mathbb{Z}\times([0,\infty)^d)^{\mathbb{Z}}$ with intensity $\alpha u^{-\alpha-1}du\otimes\lambda(dt)\otimes P^{(\Theta_t)_{t\in\mathbb{Z}}}(d\theta)$, where λ denotes the counting measure on $\mathbb{Z}$, i.e. $\lambda(B)=|B|$ for $B\subset\mathbb{Z}$. Then the stochastic process*

$$(Z_t)_{t\in\mathbb{Z}} = \left(\bigvee_{i\in\mathbb{N}} U_i\frac{\Theta_{t+T_i}^{(i)}}{\|(\Theta_l^{(i)})_{l\in\mathbb{Z}}\|_\alpha}\right)_{t\in\mathbb{Z}} \tag{3.2}$$

is an almost surely finite, stationary and max-stable process with index α. The process is furthermore regularly varying with corresponding spectral tail process $(\Theta_t^{RS})_{t\in\mathbb{Z}}$ as defined in Theorem 2.3. □

Proof. The process defined in (3.2) is stationary, since

$$\begin{aligned}(Z_{t+h})_{t\in\mathbb{Z}} &= \left(\bigvee_{i\in\mathbb{N}} U_i \frac{\Theta^{(i)}_{t+h+T_i}}{\|(\Theta^{(i)}_l)_{l\in\mathbb{Z}}\|_\alpha}\right)_{t\in\mathbb{Z}} \\ &\stackrel{d}{=} \left(\bigvee_{i\in\mathbb{N}} U_i \frac{\Theta^{(i)}_{t+T_i}}{\|(\Theta^{(i)}_l)_{l\in\mathbb{Z}}\|_\alpha}\right)_{t\in\mathbb{Z}} = (Z_t)_{t\in\mathbb{Z}}\end{aligned}$$

for all $h \in \mathbb{Z}$, because the point processes $(T_i)_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$ and $(T_i + h)_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$ have the same intensity λ and are both independent of all other random variables. Similarly as in de Haan and Ferreira (2006), Chapter 9, it follows that for $s \le t, x_n = (x_n^1, \ldots, x_n^d) \in [0,\infty)^d, s \le n \le t$ (and with $[0, x_n] := [0, x_n^1] \times \ldots \times [0, x_n^d]$)

$$\begin{aligned}& P(Z_s \le x_s, \ldots, Z_t \le x_t) \\ =\ & \exp\left(-\int\int\int \mathbb{1}_{\{([0,x_s]\times\cdots\times[0,x_t])^c\}} \left(u\frac{(\theta_{n+z})_{s\le n\le t}}{\|\theta\|_\alpha}\right)\nu_\alpha(du)\lambda(dz)P^{(\Theta_t)_{t\in\mathbb{Z}}}(d\theta)\right) \\ =\ & \exp\left(-\int \|\theta\|_\alpha^{-\alpha}\sum_{z\in\mathbb{Z}}\left(\min_{\substack{1\le i\le d\\ s\le n\le t}}\frac{x_n^i}{\theta^i_{n+z}}\right)^{-\alpha} P^{(\Theta_t)_{t\in\mathbb{Z}}}(d\theta)\right) \\ =\ & \exp\left(-\sum_{z\in\mathbb{Z}} E\left(\|(\Theta_t)_{t\in\mathbb{Z}}\|_\alpha^{-\alpha}\left(\max_{\substack{1\le i\le d\\ s\le n\le t}}\frac{\Theta^i_{n+z}}{x_n^i}\right)^\alpha\right)\right). \end{aligned} \tag{3.3}$$

This defines a proper distribution function and the process is thus almost surely finite. Furthermore, one easily sees that Equation (3.1) holds and that the process is therefore max-stable with index α. To show the regular variation of the time series, let $s \le 0 \le t$ and $x_s \ldots, x_t$ with $(x_s, \ldots, x_t) \ne 0$ as above such that for $y > 0$

$$\begin{aligned}& y^\alpha P((Z_s/y, \ldots, Z_t/y) \in ([0, x_s] \times \cdots \times [0, x_t])^c) \\ =\ & y^\alpha\left(1 - \exp\left(-\int\int\int \mathbb{1}_{\{([0,x_s]\times\cdots\times[0,x_t])^c\}}\left(u\frac{(\theta_{n+z})_{s\le n\le t}}{y\|\theta\|_\alpha}\right)\nu_\alpha(du)\lambda(dz)P^{(\Theta_t)_{t\in\mathbb{Z}}}(d\theta)\right)\right) \\ =\ & y^\alpha\left(1 - \exp\left(-\frac{1}{y^\alpha}\int\int\int \mathbb{1}_{\{([0,x_s]\times\cdots\times[0,x_t])^c\}}\left(v\frac{(\theta_{n+z})_{s\le n\le t}}{\|\theta\|_\alpha}\right)\nu_\alpha(dv)\lambda(dz)P^{(\Theta_t)_{t\in\mathbb{Z}}}(d\theta)\right)\right) \\ \to\ & \int\int\int \mathbb{1}_{\{([0,x_s]\times\cdots\times[0,x_t])^c\}}\left(v\frac{(\theta_{n+z})_{s\le n\le t}}{\|\theta\|_\alpha}\right)\nu_\alpha(dv)\lambda(dz)P^{(\Theta_t)_{t\in\mathbb{Z}}}(d\theta), \quad y\to\infty.\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $(Z_s, \ldots, Z_t)$ is regularly varying with limit measure

$$\begin{aligned}\mu(A) &= \int\int\int \mathbb{1}_A\left(v\frac{(\theta_{n+z})_{s\le n\le t}}{\|\theta\|_\alpha}\right)\nu_\alpha(dv)\lambda(dz)P^{(\Theta_t)_{t\in\mathbb{Z}}}(d\theta) \\ &= \sum_{z\in\mathbb{Z}}\int\int_0^\infty \mathbb{1}_A\left(v\frac{(\theta_{n+z})_{s\le n\le t}}{\|\theta\|_\alpha}\right)\nu_\alpha(dv)P^{(\Theta_t)_{t\in\mathbb{Z}}}(d\theta)\end{aligned} \tag{3.4}$$

for Borel sets $A \subset ([0,\infty)^d)^{t-s+1}$ bounded away from 0. Thus, for a Borel set $A \subset ([0,\infty)^d)^{t-s+1}$ and $B = ([0,\infty)^d)^{-s} \times \{(x_1, \ldots, x_d) \in [0,\infty)^d : \|(x_1, \ldots, x_d)\| > 1\} \times ([0,\infty)^d)^t$ with $\mu(\partial(A \cap B)) = 0$, we have

$$\lim_{x\to\infty} P\left(\left(\frac{Z_s}{x}, \ldots, \frac{Z_t}{x}\right) \in A \middle| \|Z_0\| > x\right)$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&= \lim_{x\to\infty} \frac{P\left(\left(\frac{Z_s}{x},\dots,\frac{Z_t}{x}\right)\in A\cap B\right)}{P\left(\left(\frac{Z_s}{x},\dots,\frac{Z_t}{x}\right)\in B\right)}\\
&= \frac{\mu(A\cap B)}{\mu(B)}.
\end{aligned}
$$

Using (3.4) and substituting $u_z = v\|\theta_z\|/\|\theta\|_\alpha$, $z\in\mathbb{Z}$, we get

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mu(A\cap B) &= \sum_{z\in\mathbb{Z}}\int\int_0^\infty \mathbb{1}_{A\cap B}\left(v\frac{(\theta_{n+z})_{s\le n\le t}}{\|\theta\|_\alpha}\right)\nu_\alpha(dv)P^{(\Theta_t)_{t\in\mathbb{Z}}}(d\theta)\\
&= \sum_{z\in\mathbb{Z}}\int\int_0^\infty \mathbb{1}_{A\cap B}\left(u_z\frac{(\theta_{n+z})_{s\le n\le t}}{\|\theta_z\|}\right)\frac{\|\theta_z\|^\alpha}{\|\theta\|_\alpha^\alpha}\nu_\alpha(du_z)P^{(\Theta_t)_{t\in\mathbb{Z}}}(d\theta)\\
&= \int\sum_{z\in\mathbb{Z}}\int_1^\infty \mathbb{1}_{A}\left(u_z\frac{(\theta_{n+z})_{s\le n\le t}}{\|\theta_z\|}\right)\nu_\alpha(du_z)\frac{\|\theta_z\|^\alpha}{\|\theta\|_\alpha^\alpha}P^{(\Theta_t)_{t\in\mathbb{Z}}}(d\theta),
\end{aligned}
$$

where we used for the substitution that, due to the definition of B, the integrand in the first line is 0 if $\|\theta_z\| = 0$ and we used in the last equation that $u_z(\theta_{n+z})_{s\le n\le t}/\|\theta_z\| \in B$ if and only if $u_z \ge 1$. But the last expression is equal to

$$
P((Y\cdot\Theta_s^{\mathrm{RS}},\dots,Y\cdot\Theta_t^{\mathrm{RS}})\in A)
$$

for a random variable Y with Pareto(α) distribution independent of $(\Theta_s^{\mathrm{RS}},\dots,\Theta_t^{\mathrm{RS}})$. Analogously, one can show that $\mu(B) = 1$ and thus, by Remark 1.2, the process $(Z_t)_{t\in\mathbb{Z}}$ has spectral tail process $(\Theta_t^{\mathrm{RS}})_{t\in\mathbb{Z}}$, which completes the proof. □

Corollary 3.3. *If $(\Theta_t)_{t\in\mathbb{Z}}$ satisfies both Property (SC) and Property (TCF), then the spectral tail process of $(Z_t)_{t\in\mathbb{Z}}$ as defined in (3.2) is given by $(\Theta_t)_{t\in\mathbb{Z}}$.* □

Proof. This follows immediately from Theorem 3.2 in connection with Theorem 2.3. □

Remark 3.4. *The construction of a max-stable process as in Theorem 3.2 only works if all components of the spectral tail process are non-negative. To overcome this and to describe the general dependence structure between observations that are extremely large or small (i.e. smaller than $-c$ for $c\to\infty$) we can look instead at the $2d$-dimensional, non-negative process $(\Theta_t^{\pm})_{t\in\mathbb{Z}} := ((\Theta_t^1)_+,(\Theta_t^1)_-,\dots,(\Theta_t^d)_+,(\Theta_t^d)_-)_{t\in\mathbb{Z}}$ with $x_+ = \max(x,0), x_- = \max(-x,0)$.* □

Finally, we show that the max-stable process constructed in Theorem 3.2 is actually the "maximum attractor" (i.e. the limiting distribution for maxima) for the process underlying $(\Theta_t)_{t\in\mathbb{Z}}$. All maxima are meant to be taken componentwise.

Proposition 3.5. *Let $(X_t)_{t\in\mathbb{Z}}$ with values in $\mathbb{R}^d$ be a stationary regularly varying time series with index $\alpha > 0$ and spectral tail process $(\Theta_t)_{t\in\mathbb{Z}}$ with values in $[0,\infty)^d$ that satisfies Property (SC). Then, for each $t\in\mathbb{N}_0$, there exists a sequence $b_n > 0, n\in\mathbb{N}$, of normalizing constants such that*

$$
\bigvee_{i=1}^n \frac{(X_0,\dots,X_t)^i}{b_n} \overset{w}{\Rightarrow} (Z_0,\dots,Z_t),\quad n\to\infty,
$$

where $(X_0,\dots,X_t)^i, i\in\mathbb{N}$, are i.i.d. copies of $(X_0,\dots,X_t)$ and $(Z_0,\dots,Z_t)$ has the distribution as defined in Theorem 3.2. □

Proof. Note first that since $(X_t)_{t\in\mathbb{Z}}$ is stationary, the process $(\Theta_t)_{t\in\mathbb{Z}}$ satisfies Property (TCF) and thus all assumptions of Theorem 3.2 and Corollary 3.3 are satisfied. The stationary time series $(X_t)_{t\in\mathbb{Z}}$ is multivariate regularly varying if and only if all $(X_0,\dots,X_t), t\in\mathbb{N}_0$, are multivariate regularly varying. By Proposition 7.1 in Resnick (2007) this is equivalent to the existence of a normalizing sequence $\tilde{b}_n > 0, n\in\mathbb{N}$, such that

$$\bigvee_{i=1}^{n} \frac{(X_0,\dots,X_t)^i}{\tilde{b}_n} \overset{w}{\Rightarrow} (U_0,\dots,U_t), \quad n\to\infty,$$

for some random vector $(U_0,\dots,U_t)$ with a non-degenerate distribution. This distribution is (up to a scaling factor which only depends on $\tilde{b}_n, n\in\mathbb{N}$) determined by the limit law of regular variation of $(X_0,\dots,X_t)$ and this is in turn (up to a constant) determined by the spectral tail process $(\Theta_t)_{t\in\mathbb{Z}}$ and the index α of regular variation, see the proof of Theorem 2.1 in Basrak and Segers (2009). Therefore, since the processes $(Z_t)_{t\in\mathbb{Z}}$ from Theorem 3.2 and $(X_t)_{t\in\mathbb{Z}}$ have the same spectral tail process and index of regular variation, there exist $\tilde{b}'_n > 0, n\in\mathbb{N}$, such that

$$\bigvee_{i=1}^{n} \frac{(Z_0,\dots,Z_t)^i}{\tilde{b}'_n} \overset{w}{\Rightarrow} (U_0,\dots,U_t), \quad n\to\infty,$$

where $(Z_0,\dots,Z_t)^i, i\in\mathbb{N}$, are i.i.d. copies of $(Z_0,\dots,Z_t)$. But we also know from Definition 3.1 and Theorem 3.2 that

$$\bigvee_{i=1}^{n} \frac{(Z_0,\dots,Z_t)^i}{n^{1/\alpha}} \overset{d}{=} (Z_0,\dots,Z_t),$$

which implies by the convergence to types theorem that

$$(U_0,\dots,U_t) \overset{d}{=} c\cdot(Z_0,\dots,Z_t)$$

for some $c>0$. Setting $b_n = c\tilde{b}_n$ then leads to the result. □

Proposition 3.5 and Theorem 3.2 combined with Corollary 3.3 provide a view on the extremal behavior of a random process that is somehow complementary to the description given by the spectral tail process. The latter one only describes the behavior given that we have seen an extremal event *at a specific time*. The process constructed in Theorem 3.2 shares the extremal behavior of a process with given spectral tail process in the sense of Proposition 3.5 and thus gives us an impression about when the extremal events will happen over time. "Extremal episodes" of the process in (3.2) will typically occur for an extremely large value of U_i and the corresponding "epicenters" T_i are uniformly distributed over time. Due to Property (SC), the influence of a large value of U_i will only be visible in a certain neighborhood around the corresponding time T_i and, roughly speaking, extremal events will become more and more independent if the elapsed time between them grows.

From a statistical point of view, it is important to connect the extremal behavior that we see in the observations from a stationary time series to the extremal behavior of the stationary distribution, i.e. the distribution at a fixed point in time (or maybe even the joint distribution at specific lags). The extremal behavior of the stationary distribution can be described by $\lim_{x\to\infty}\mathcal{L}(X_0/\|X_0\| \mid \|X_0\|>x) = \mathcal{L}(\Theta_0)$. Surely, the extremal realizations of a time series are the ones to look at for this task, but if we have an extremal cluster of events we look at the process at *random* points in time. One may then ask which of those extremal observations from an observed cluster best represents a

"typical" extremal observation, i.e. an extremal observation from the stationary distribution. This question is even more important if one wants to decrease dependence between used observations and therefore choses only one observation per cluster for inference. This is for example done in the declustering approach of the POT method as introduced in Davison and Smith (1990), and has by now become a standard tool for the extremal analysis of time series. Here one chooses (in a univariate setting) the cluster maximum as a representative for the whole cluster and treats the remaining observations as extremal outcomes of the stationary distribution which are next to i.i.d. As Proposition 3.5 shows, the extremal clusters can be seen as realizations of $(\Theta_t)_{t\in\mathbb{Z}}$ with random scaling and under an unobservable shift in time, T_i. So we will usually not observe $(\Theta_t)_{t\in\mathbb{Z}}$ but, with the notation from Section 2, only $(\Theta_{T^*+t}/\|\Theta^*\|)_{t\in\mathbb{Z}}$, that is the self-standardized process that has maximum norm 1 and is shifted in a way such that the maximal norm is first attained at time zero. Alternatively, the observation could also be seen as a realization in the quotient space of double-sided sequences with respect to the shift operator, cf. the space $\tilde{l}_0$ in Basrak et al. (2016). The conditional distribution of $(\Theta_t)_{t\in\mathbb{Z}}$, given the shifted and rescaled observation as just described, is found in the next proposition.

Proposition 3.6. *Let $(\Theta_t)_{t\in\mathbb{Z}}$ be a time series which satisfies Property (TCF) and Property (SC). Then, with the notation from (2.1), (2.2),*

$$\mathcal{L}\left((\Theta_t)_{t\in\mathbb{Z}}\middle|\left(\frac{\Theta_{T^*+t}}{\|\Theta^*\|}\right)_{t\in\mathbb{Z}}\right)=\sum_{k\in\mathbb{Z}}\frac{\|\Theta_{T^*+k}\|^\alpha}{\|(\Theta_t)_{t\in\mathbb{Z}}\|_\alpha^\alpha}\,\delta_{\left(\frac{\Theta_{T^*+k+t}}{\|\Theta_{T^*+k}\|}\right)_{t\in\mathbb{Z}}}, \tag{3.5}$$

where δ_x denotes the Dirac measure in $x\in(\mathbb{R}^d)^{\mathbb{Z}}$. □

Proof. Note first that the random probability measure on the r.h.s. in (3.5), applied to some $A\subset\mathcal{B}((\mathbb{R}^d)^{\mathbb{Z}})$, is equal to

$$\begin{aligned}&\sum_{k\in\mathbb{Z}}\frac{\|\Theta_{T^*+k}\|^\alpha}{\|(\Theta_t)_{t\in\mathbb{Z}}\|_\alpha^\alpha}\,\mathbb{1}_A\left(\left(\frac{\Theta_{T^*+k+t}}{\|\Theta_{T^*+k}\|}\right)_{t\in\mathbb{Z}}\right)\\ =\;&\sum_{k\in\mathbb{Z}}\frac{\|\Theta_{T^*+k}/\|\Theta^*\|\|^\alpha}{\|(\Theta_{T^*+t})_{t\in\mathbb{Z}}/\|\Theta^*\|\|_\alpha^\alpha}\,\mathbb{1}_A\left(\left(\frac{\Theta_{T^*+k+t}/\|\Theta^*\|}{\|\Theta_{T^*+k}/\|\Theta^*\|\|}\right)_{t\in\mathbb{Z}}\right)\end{aligned}$$

and is thus a measurable function of the conditioning expression. Next we show that the Radon Nikodym equation holds. To this end, let $A,B\subset\mathcal{B}((\mathbb{R}^d)^{\mathbb{Z}})$. Then, from Theorem 2.3,

$$\begin{aligned}&P\left((\Theta_t)_{t\in\mathbb{Z}}\in A,\left(\frac{\Theta_{T^*+t}}{\|\Theta^*\|}\right)_{t\in\mathbb{Z}}\in B\right)\\ =\;&E\left(\sum_{l\in\mathbb{Z}}\frac{\|\Theta_l\|^\alpha}{\|(\Theta_t)_{t\in\mathbb{Z}}\|_\alpha^\alpha}\mathbb{1}_A\left(\left(\frac{\Theta_{l+t}}{\|\Theta_l\|}\right)_{t\in\mathbb{Z}}\right)\mathbb{1}_B\left(\left(\frac{\Theta_{T^*((\Theta_{l+t})_{t\in\mathbb{Z}})+l+t}}{\|\Theta^*\|((\Theta_{l+t})_{t\in\mathbb{Z}})}\right)_{t\in\mathbb{Z}}\right)\right)\\ =\;&E\left(\sum_{l\in\mathbb{Z}}\frac{\|\Theta_l\|^\alpha}{\|(\Theta_t)_{t\in\mathbb{Z}}\|_\alpha^\alpha}\mathbb{1}_A\left(\left(\frac{\Theta_{l+t}}{\|\Theta_l\|}\right)_{t\in\mathbb{Z}}\right)\mathbb{1}_B\left(\left(\frac{\Theta_{T^*+t}}{\|\Theta^*\|}\right)_{t\in\mathbb{Z}}\right)\right)\\ =\;&E\left(\sum_{k\in\mathbb{Z}}\frac{\|\Theta_{T^*+k}\|^\alpha}{\|(\Theta_t)_{t\in\mathbb{Z}}\|_\alpha^\alpha}\mathbb{1}_A\left(\left(\frac{\Theta_{T^*+k+t}}{\|\Theta_{T^*+k}\|}\right)_{t\in\mathbb{Z}}\right)\mathbb{1}_B\left(\left(\frac{\Theta_{T^*+t}}{\|\Theta^*\|}\right)_{t\in\mathbb{Z}}\right)\right),\end{aligned}$$

which finishes the proof. □

One way to interpret Proposition 3.6 is that, given an observation of $(\Theta_{T^*+t}/\|\Theta^*\|)_{t\in\mathbb{Z}}$ (and if the maximum norm is attained only once) this very sequence itself is also the most likely of all possible underlying sequences $(\Theta_t)_{t\in\mathbb{Z}}$, because the weight in (3.5) is largest for $k = 0$. Therefore, $\Theta_{T^*}/\|\Theta^*\|$ can be seen as the best approximation of Θ_0 from the observed sequence, which makes the representational choice of the observation with maximal norm from a cluster reasonable.

4 Construction of a max-stable process with given spectral tail process in the general case

So far, we have focussed on processes $(\Theta_t)_{t\in\mathbb{Z}}$ which satisfy both Property (TCF) and Property (SC). Corollary 3.3 shows that this ensures the existence of a max-stable underlying process which realizes $(\Theta_t)_{t\in\mathbb{Z}}$ as a spectral tail process. In fact, this max-stable process is of a specific form which is called a *mixed moving maxima (M3) process*, cf. for example Definition 7 in Dombry and Kabluchko (2016) for the univariate case where $\alpha = 1$. Dombry and Kabluchko (2016) show that a (univariate) max-stable process has a representation as a M3 process of the above form if and only if the process is (purely) dissipative, cf. Theorem 8 in Dombry and Kabluchko (2016) and Theorem 5.4 in Wang and Stoev (2010), where also the case for general α is covered explicitly. Intuitively, this case implies that the impact of an extremal event at time 0 may in principle last on forever (since $\|\Theta_t\| > 0$ for all $t \in \mathbb{Z}$ is possible) but that it diminishes over time since $\|\Theta_t\| \to 0$ as $|t| \to \infty$ almost surely.

We shall now look at the case where $(\Theta_t)_{t\in\mathbb{Z}}$ satisfies Property (TCF) but not necessarily Property (SC) for a given value of $\alpha > 0$. If Property (SC) is not satisfied, then this implies by Lemma 2.2 that $P(T^* \notin \mathbb{Z}) > 0$ and, roughly speaking, this corresponds to the case where an extremal event at time 0 will actually "return" infinitely often, for example in a periodic manner, like the following example shows.

Example 4.1 (Simple periodic spectral tail process). *Let $d = 1$ and*

$$\Theta_t = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } t \in 2\mathbb{Z}, \\ 0 & \text{if } t \in 2\mathbb{Z} + 1. \end{cases}$$

One easily checks that the process $(\Theta_t)_{t\in\mathbb{Z}}$ satisfies Property (TCF) for any $\alpha > 0$ but there exists no $\alpha > 0$ such that $(\Theta_t)_{t\in\mathbb{Z}}$ also satisfies Property (SC). Define now

$$X_t = U \cdot (\Theta_{t+B}), \quad t \in \mathbb{Z},$$

where U is a Frechet(α) r.v. and B is Binomial(0.5) distributed and independent of U. It is easily seen that $(X_t)_{t\in\mathbb{Z}}$ is a stationary max-stable process. Since $|X_0| > x$ for $x > 0$ implies that $B = 0$, the resulting spectral tail process of $(X_t)_{t\in\mathbb{Z}}$ is given by $(\Theta_t)_{t\in\mathbb{Z}}$. □

The following theorem shows how the construction principle from the above example can be generalized in order to construct a corresponding stationary max-stable process with index set $\mathbb{N}_0$ for a general process $(\Theta_t)_{t\in\mathbb{Z}}$ which satisfies Property (TCF). We restrict ourselves again to the non-negative case, but note that an analogue of Remark 3.4 holds in this case as well.

Theorem 4.2. *Let $(\Theta_t)_{t\in\mathbb{Z}}$ with values in $[0,\infty)^d$ be a stochastic process which satisfies Property (TCF). Furthermore, for $j \in \mathbb{N}_0$ let $(U_i^{(j)}, (\Theta_t^{(j,i)})_{t\in\mathbb{Z}})_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$ be an enumeration of points from a*

Poisson point process on $(0,\infty)\times([0,\infty)^d)^{\mathbb{Z}}$ *with intensity* $\alpha u^{-\alpha-1}du\otimes P^{(\Theta_t)_{t\in\mathbb{Z}}}(d\theta)$ *and let those Poisson point processes be independent for different values of* j*. Then the stochastic process*

$$(Z_t)_{t\in\mathbb{N}_0}=\left(\bigvee_{j=0}^{t}\bigvee_{i\in\mathbb{N}}U_i^{(j)}\mathbb{1}_{\{\|\Theta_{-j}^{(j,i)}\|=\ldots=\|\Theta_{-1}^{(j,i)}\|=0\}}\Theta_{t-j}^{(j,i)}\right)_{t\in\mathbb{N}_0} \tag{4.1}$$

(where for $j=0$ *the indicator function is to be interpreted as being equal to 1 almost surely) is an almost surely finite, stationary and max-stable process with index* α*. The process is furthermore regularly varying with corresponding forward spectral tail process* $(\Theta_t)_{t\in\mathbb{N}_0}$*.* □

Proof. To show the stationarity of the process we show that for all $n\in\mathbb{N}$, $(Z_0,\ldots,Z_n)\stackrel{d}{=}(Z_1,\ldots,Z_{n+1})$. To this end, let $x=(x_0,\ldots,x_n)\in([0,\infty)^d)^{n+1}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}&P(Z_1\le x_0,\ldots,Z_{n+1}\le x_n)\\ =\;&\exp\left(-\sum_{j=0}^{n+1}\int\int\mathbb{1}_{[0,x]^c}\left(y(\theta_{t-j})_{1\le t\le n+1}\mathbb{1}_{\{\|\theta_{-j}\|=\ldots=\|\theta_{-1}\|=0\}}\right)\nu_\alpha(dy)P^{(\Theta)_{t\in\mathbb{N}}}(d\theta)\right).\end{aligned} \tag{4.2}$$

For the exponent, we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\sum_{j=0}^{n+1}\int\int\mathbb{1}_{[0,x]^c}\left(y(\theta_{t-j})_{1\le t\le n+1}\mathbb{1}_{\{\|\theta_{-j}\|=\ldots=\|\theta_{-1}\|=0\}}\right)\nu_\alpha(dy)P^{(\Theta)_{t\in\mathbb{N}}}(d\theta)\\ =\;&\sum_{j=0}^{n+1}\int\int\mathbb{1}_{[0,x]^c}\left(y(\theta_{t-j})_{1\le t\le n+1}\right)\nu_\alpha(dy)P^{(\Theta)_{t\in\mathbb{N}}}(d\theta)\\ &-\sum_{j=1}^{n+1}\sum_{m=1}^{j}\int E\left(\mathbb{1}_{[0,x]^c}\left(y(\Theta_{t-j})_{1\le t\le n+1}\mathbb{1}_{\{\|\Theta_{-m}\|>0,\|\Theta_{-m+1}\|=\ldots=\|\Theta_{-1}\|=0\}}\right)\right)\nu_\alpha(dy)\end{aligned} \tag{4.3}$$

For the integrals of the second expression we have from Property (TCF) that

$$\begin{aligned}&\int E\left(\mathbb{1}_{[0,x]^c}\left(y(\Theta_{t-j})_{1\le t\le n+1}\mathbb{1}_{\{\|\Theta_{-m}\|>0,\|\Theta_{-m+1}\|=\ldots=\|\Theta_{-1}\|=0\}}\right)\right)\nu_\alpha(dy)\\ =\;&\int E\left(\mathbb{1}_{[0,x]^c}\left(y\left(\frac{\Theta_{t+m-j}}{\|\Theta_m\|}\right)_{1\le t\le n+1}\mathbb{1}_{\{\|\Theta_1\|=\ldots=\|\Theta_{m-1}\|=0\}}\right)\|\Theta_m\|^\alpha\right)\nu_\alpha(dy)\\ =\;&\int\int\mathbb{1}_{[0,x]^c}\left(y\left(\frac{\theta_{t+m-j}}{\|\theta_m\|}\right)_{1\le t\le n+1}\mathbb{1}_{\{\|\theta_1\|=\ldots=\|\theta_{m-1}\|=0\}}\right)\|\theta_m\|^\alpha\nu_\alpha(dy)P^{(\Theta)_{t\in\mathbb{N}}}(d\theta)\\ =\;&\int\int\mathbb{1}_{[0,x]^c}\left(u(\theta_{t+m-j})_{1\le t\le n+1}\mathbb{1}_{\{\|\theta_1\|=\ldots=\|\theta_{m-1}\|=0,\|\theta_m\|>0\}}\right)\nu_\alpha(du)P^{(\Theta)_{t\in\mathbb{N}}}(d\theta)\end{aligned}$$

by substituting u for $y/\|\theta_m\|$. Thus, the expression in (4.3) equals

$$\begin{aligned}&\int\int\mathbb{1}_{[0,x]^c}\left(y(\theta_t)_{1\le t\le n+1}\right)\nu_\alpha(dy)P^{(\Theta)_{t\in\mathbb{N}}}(d\theta)\\ &-\sum_{j=1}^{n+1}\int\int\mathbb{1}_{[0,x]^c}\left(u(\theta_t)_{1\le t\le n+1}\mathbb{1}_{\{\|\theta_1\|=\ldots=\|\theta_{j-1}\|=0,\|\theta_j\|>0\}}\right)\nu_\alpha(du)P^{(\Theta)_{t\in\mathbb{N}}}(d\theta)\end{aligned}$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&+ \sum_{j=1}^{n+1} \int\int \mathbb{1}_{[0,x]^c}\left(y(\theta_{t-j})_{1\le t\le n+1}\right) \nu_\alpha(dy) P^{(\Theta)_{t\in\mathbb{N}}}(d\theta) \\
&\quad - \sum_{j=2}^{n+1}\sum_{m=1}^{j-1} \int\int \mathbb{1}_{[0,x]^c}\left(u(\theta_{t+m-j})_{1\le t\le n+1}\mathbb{1}_{\{\|\theta_1\|=\ldots=\|\theta_{m-1}\|=0,\|\theta_m\|>0\}}\right) \nu_\alpha(du) P^{(\Theta)_{t\in\mathbb{N}}}(d\theta).
\end{aligned}
$$

The first two terms sum up to

$$
\int\int \mathbb{1}_{[0,x]^c}\left(u(\theta_t)_{1\le t\le n+1}\mathbb{1}_{\{\|\theta_1\|=\ldots=\|\theta_{n+1}\|=0\}}\right) \nu_\alpha(du) P^{(\Theta)_{t\in\mathbb{N}}}(d\theta) = 0
$$

and the last two are after a change of index equal to

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{j=0}^{n} \int\int \mathbb{1}_{[0,x]^c}\left(y(\theta_{t-j})_{0\le t\le n}\right) \nu_\alpha(dy) P^{(\Theta)_{t\in\mathbb{N}}}(d\theta) \\
&\quad - \sum_{j=1}^{n}\sum_{m=1}^{j} \int\int \mathbb{1}_{[0,x]^c}\left(u(\theta_{t+m-j})_{0\le t\le n}\mathbb{1}_{\{\|\theta_1\|=\ldots=\|\theta_{m-1}\|=0,\|\theta_m\|>0\}}\right) \nu_\alpha(du) P^{(\Theta)_{t\in\mathbb{N}}}(d\theta) \\
= &\sum_{j=0}^{n} \int\int \mathbb{1}_{[0,x]^c}\left(y(\theta_{t-j})_{0\le t\le n}\right) \nu_\alpha(dy) P^{(\Theta)_{t\in\mathbb{N}}}(d\theta) \\
&\quad - \sum_{j=1}^{n}\sum_{m=1}^{j} \int\int \mathbb{1}_{[0,x]^c}\left(u(\theta_{t-j})_{0\le t\le n}\mathbb{1}_{\{\|\theta_{-m+1}\|=\ldots=\|\theta_{-1}\|=0,\|\theta_{-m}\|>0\}}\right) \nu_\alpha(du) P^{(\Theta)_{t\in\mathbb{N}}}(d\theta) \\
= &\sum_{j=0}^{n} \int\int \mathbb{1}_{[0,x]^c}\left(y(\theta_{t-j})_{0\le t\le n}\mathbb{1}_{\{\|\theta_{-j}\|=\ldots=\|\theta_{-1}\|=0\}}\right) \nu_\alpha(dy) P^{(\Theta)_{t\in\mathbb{N}}}(d\theta),
\end{aligned}
$$

where we again used the Property (TCF). So the expression in (4.2) equals

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\exp\left(-\sum_{j=0}^{n} \int\int \mathbb{1}_{[0,x]^c}\left(y(\theta_{t-j})_{0\le t\le n}\mathbb{1}_{\{\|\theta_{-j}\|=\ldots=\|\theta_{-1}\|=0\}}\right) \nu_\alpha(dy) P^{(\Theta)_{t\in\mathbb{N}}}(d\theta)\right) \\
= &\ P(Z_0\le x_0,\ldots,Z_n\le x_n),
\end{aligned}
$$

which shows the stationarity of $(Z_t)_{t\in\mathbb{N}}$. We also see that the expression is a proper distribution function and that therefore $(Z_t)_{t\in\mathbb{N}}$ is almost surely finite.

For any $x=(x_0,\ldots,x_n)\in([0,\infty)^d)^{n+1}$ and $k\in\mathbb{N}$ we have furthermore (by substituting u for $k^{1/\alpha}y$) that

$$
\begin{aligned}
&P(Z_0\le k^{-1/\alpha}x_0,\ldots,Z_n\le k^{-1/\alpha}x_n) \\
= &\exp\left(-\sum_{j=0}^{n} \int\int \mathbb{1}_{[0,k^{-1/\alpha}x]^c}\left(y(\theta_{t-j})_{0\le t\le n}\mathbb{1}_{\{\|\theta_{-j}\|=\ldots=\|\theta_{-1}\|=0\}}\right) \nu_\alpha(dy) P^{(\Theta)_{t\in\mathbb{N}}}(d\theta)\right) \\
= &\exp\left(-k\sum_{j=0}^{n} \int\int \mathbb{1}_{[0,x]^c}\left(u(\theta_{t-j})_{0\le t\le n}\mathbb{1}_{\{\|\theta_{-j}\|=\ldots=\|\theta_{-1}\|=0\}}\right) \nu_\alpha(du) P^{(\Theta)_{t\in\mathbb{N}}}(d\theta)\right) \\
= &\ (P(Z_0\le x_1,\ldots,Z_n\le x_n))^k,
\end{aligned}
$$

so the process satisfies Definition 3.1 and is thereby max-stable. In order to show that the process is also regularly varying, choose $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $x \in ([0,\infty)^d)^{n+1}, x \neq 0$. Then, for $z > 0$, and again with a substitution we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& z^\alpha P((Z_0/z, \dots, Z_n/z) \in [0,x]^c) \\
= \;& z^\alpha \left(1 - \exp\left(-\sum_{j=0}^{n} \int\int \mathbb{1}_{[0,zx]^c}\left(y(\theta_{t-j})_{0\le t\le n}\mathbb{1}_{\{\|\theta_{-j}\|=\dots=\|\theta_{-1}\|=0\}}\right)\nu_\alpha(dy)P^{(\Theta)_{t\in\mathbb{N}}}(d\theta)\right)\right) \\
= \;& z^\alpha \left(1 - \exp\left(-z^{-\alpha}\sum_{j=0}^{n} \int\int \mathbb{1}_{[0,x]^c}\left(y(\theta_{t-j})_{0\le t\le n}\mathbb{1}_{\{\|\theta_{-j}\|=\dots=\|\theta_{-1}\|=0\}}\right)\nu_\alpha(dy)P^{(\Theta)_{t\in\mathbb{N}}}(d\theta)\right)\right) \\
\to \;& \sum_{j=0}^{n} \int\int \mathbb{1}_{[0,x]^c}\left(y(\theta_{t-j})_{0\le t\le n}\mathbb{1}_{\{\|\theta_{-j}\|=\dots=\|\theta_{-1}\|=0\}}\right)\nu_\alpha(dy)P^{(\Theta)_{t\in\mathbb{N}}}(d\theta), \quad z\to\infty,
\end{aligned}$$

which shows that $(Z_0, \dots, Z_n)$ is regularly varying with limit measure

$$\mu(A) = \sum_{j=0}^{n} \int\int \mathbb{1}_A\left(y(\theta_{t-j})_{0\le t\le n}\mathbb{1}_{\{\|\theta_{-j}\|=\dots=\|\theta_{-1}\|=0\}}\right)\nu_\alpha(dy)P^{(\Theta)_{t\in\mathbb{N}}}(d\theta)$$

for sets A bounded away from $(0,\dots,0)$. Note that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mu(A \cap \{(x_0,\dots,x_n) : \|x_0\| > 1\}) \\
= \;& \sum_{j=0}^{n} \int\int \mathbb{1}_{A\cap\{(x_0,\dots,x_n):\|x_0\|>1\}}\left(y(\theta_{t-j})_{0\le t\le n}\mathbb{1}_{\{\|\theta_{-j}\|=\dots=\|\theta_{-1}\|=0\}}\right)\nu_\alpha(dy)P^{(\Theta)_{t\in\mathbb{N}}}(d\theta) \\
= \;& \int\int_1^\infty \mathbb{1}_A\left(y(\theta_t)_{0\le t\le n}\right)\nu_\alpha(dy)P^{(\Theta)_{t\in\mathbb{N}}}(d\theta)
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\mu(\{(x_0,\dots,x_n) : \|x_0\| > 1\}) = \int\int_1^\infty \mathbb{1}_{([0,\infty)^d)^{n+1}}\left(y(\theta_t)_{0\le t\le n}\right)\nu_\alpha(dy)P^{(\Theta)_{t\in\mathbb{N}}}(d\theta) = 1,$$

such that for Borel sets A with $\mu(\partial(A\cap\{(x_0,\dots,x_n) : \|x_0\| > 1\})) = 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}
& P((Z_0/z,\dots,Z_n/z) \in A \mid \|Z_0\| > z) \\
\to \;& \frac{\mu(A\cap\{(x_0,\dots,x_n) : \|x_0\| > 1\})}{\mu(\{(x_0,\dots,x_n) : \|x_0\| > 1\})}, \quad z\to\infty, \\
= \;& \int\int_1^\infty \mathbb{1}_A\left(y(\theta_t)_{0\le t\le n}\right)\nu_\alpha(dy)P^{(\Theta)_{t\in\mathbb{N}}}(d\theta) \\
= \;& P((Y\cdot\Theta_0,\dots,Y\cdot\Theta_n)\in A),
\end{aligned}$$

for a Pareto(α) distributed random variable Y independent of $(\Theta_t)_{t\in\mathbb{N}_0}$. By Remark 1.2, this proves the statement. □

Corollary 4.3. *For any stochastic process $(\Theta_t)_{t\in\mathbb{Z}}$ with values in $[0,\infty)^d$ that satisfies Property (TCF) there exists a stationary max-stable process $(X_t)_{t\in\mathbb{Z}}$ that has $(\Theta_t)_{t\in\mathbb{Z}}$ as its corresponding spectral tail process.* □

Proof. Theorem 4.2 shows that there always exists a stationary process $(Z_t)_{t\in\mathbb{N}_0}$ which has forward spectral process $(\Theta_t)_{t\in\mathbb{N}_0}$. By the Kolmogorov extension theorem there then also exists a regularly varying stationary process $(X_t)_{t\in\mathbb{Z}}$ such that $(X_t)_{t\in\mathbb{N}_0} \stackrel{d}{=} (Z_t)_{t\in\mathbb{N}_0}$, see, e.g., Lemma 6.1.19 in Stroock (1994). The distribution of a process which satisfies Property (TCF) is completely determined by its forward process, i.e. the process on the index set $\mathbb{N}_0$, see Lemma 2.2 in Basrak and Segers (2009). Thus, since the distributions of $(\Theta_t)_{t\in\mathbb{N}_0}$ and of the forward spectral process of $(X_t)_{t\in\mathbb{Z}}$ coincide, we can conclude that the spectral process of $(X_t)_{t\in\mathbb{Z}}$ has the same distribution as $(\Theta_t)_{t\in\mathbb{Z}}$. □

An analogue to Proposition 3.5 holds in this case as well, i.e. the process $(Z_t)_{t\in\mathbb{N}_0}$ from Theorem 4.2 is the maximum attractor of the process which underlies $(\Theta_t)_{t\in\mathbb{Z}}$. The proof of this result is completely along the lines of the proof of Proposition 3.5.

References

Basrak, B., Planinić, H. and Soulier, P. (2016). An invariance principle for sums and record times of regularly varying stationary sequences. *ArXiv preprint* arXiv:1609.00687, available at `https://arxiv.org/abs/1609.00687`.

Basrak, B. and Segers, J. (2009). Regularly varying multivariate time series. *Stoch. Proc. Appl.* **119**, 1055–1080.

Davison, A. C. and Smith, R. L. (1990). Models for exceedances over high thresholds (with discussion). *J. R. Stat. Soc. Series B* **52**, 393–442.

Dombry, C. and Kabluchko, Z. (2016). Ergodic decompositions of stationary max-stable processes in terms of their spectral functions. *ArXiv preprint* arXiv:1601.00792, available at `https://arxiv.org/abs/1601.00792`.

Engelke, S., Malinowski, A., Oesting, M. and Schlather, M. (2014). Statistical inference for max-stable processes by conditioning on extreme events. *Adv. in Appl. Probab.* **46**, 478–495.

de Haan, L. and Ferreira, A. (2006). *Extreme Value Theory: An Introduction*. Springer, New York.

Janßen, A. and Segers, J. (2014). Markov tail chains. *J. Appl. Probab.* **51**, 1133–1153.

Resnick, S. I. (2007). *Heavy-Tail Phenomena, Probabilistic and Statistical Modeling*. Springer, New York.

Rosinski, J. (1995). On the structure of stationary stable processes. *Ann. Probab.* **23**, 1163–1187.

Roy, P. and Samorodnitsky. G. (2008). Stationary symmetric α-stable discrete parameter random fields. *J. Theoret. Probab.* **21**, 212–233.

Segers, J., Zhao, Y. and Meinguet, T. (2017). Polar decomposition of regularly varying time series in star-shaped metric spaces. *Extremes*, forthcoming.

Stroock, D. W. (1994). *Probability Theory, an Analytic View*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Wang, Y. and Stoev, S. (2010). On the structure and representations of max-stable processes. *Adv. Appl. Probab.* **42**, 855–877.